

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/339,352

Applicant(s)

Reed-Gitomer et al.

Examiner

Hope Robinson

Group Art Unit

1653



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hope Robinson(3) Thomas Boyce (43,508) For Mark Wilson(2) Karen Carlson

(4) _____

Date of Interview Mar 27, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: Application in general

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:


Mr. Boyce informed me that he would be able to have a supplemental brief delivered to the PTO by Friday and asked for clarification as to what needed to be corrected. Informed Mr. Boyce that claims 1 and 12 submitted in the brief do not accurately reflect the claim language of record in the application. Also informed Mr. Boyce that although Exhibit 1 is listed in the first appeal brief submitted in Paper No. 14 Exhibit 1 was not clearly labeled and the supplemental appeal brief submitted in Paper No. 17 is missing the exhibit and figures, thus would result in a remand from the board as it represents essential information.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached


KAREN COCHRANE CARLSON, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER


Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/339,352

Applicant(s)

Reed-Gitomer et al.

Examiner

Hope Robinson

Art Unit

1653



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hope Robinson(3) Mark Wilson(2) Karen Carlson

(4) _____

Date of Interview May 27, 2002Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: Application in general

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

A fax was sent to Mr. Wilson on May 24, 2002 of a proposed claim to get the above application in condition for allowance. Mr. Wilson left me a voice mail on May 27, 2002 to inform me that the proposed claim was reviewed with his client and is not acceptable as they feel the specification entitles them to more mutations than is recited in the proposed claim and believe that they have a good chance going to the board.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

KAREN COCHRANE CARLSON, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

*** TX REPORT ***

TRANSMISSION OK

TX/RX NO	4158	
CONNECTION TEL		915125364598
SUBADDRESS		
CONNECTION ID		
ST. TIME	05/24 11:12	
USAGE T	01'05	
PGS.	3	
RESULT	OK	

TO: Mark Wilson
Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P.

DATE: May 24, 2002

PHONE: 512-536-3035


FAX: 512-536-4598

FROM: Examiner Hope Robinson
USPTO

PHONE: 703-308-6231

RE: 09/339,352

3 pages

Attached is a draft copy of a claim to put the above application in condition for allowance prepared by Primary Examiner Karen Carlson. Please review and provide feed back 

TO: Mark Wilson
Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P.

DATE: May 24, 2002

PHONE: 512-536-3035


FAX: 512-536-4598

FROM: Examiner Hope Robinson
USPTO

PHONE: 703-308-6231

RE: 09/339,352

3 pages

Attached is a draft copy of a claim to put the above application in condition for allowance prepared by Primary Examiner Karen Carlson. Please review and provide feed back 

27. A method for screening for an increased risk of hypercalciuria in a subject comprising:

(a) determining mutations that indicate an increased risk of hypercalciuria by:

(i) screening a group of subjects having confirmed hypercalciuria for mutations in the genomic region comprising chromosome 1q23.3-1q24, wherein said screening method comprises obtaining a nucleic acid sample from each subject and detecting mutations in said genomic region;

(ii) screening a group of control subjects for mutations in the genomic region comprising chromosome 1q23.3-1q24, wherein said screening method comprises obtaining a nucleic acid sample from each subject and detecting mutations in said genomic region;

(iii) determining mutations that indicate an increased risk of hypercalciuria by comparing the presence of genetic mutations in said genomic region of the group of subjects having confirmed hypercalciuria with the genetic mutations in said genomic region of the group of control subjects, wherein the presence or preponderance of mutations found in the group of subjects having confirmed hypercalciuria and not found or found to a lesser extent in the group of control subjects indicates a mutation that is associated with increased risk of hypercalciuria;

(b) obtaining a sample of nucleic acid from an individual subject;

(c) analyzing the sample nucleic acid from said individual subject to detect the presence or absence of a genetic mutation in the genomic region comprising chromosome 1q23.3-1q24,
and

(d) comparing the presence of a genetic mutation in the genomic region comprising chromosome 1q23.3-1q24 of said individual subject with determined in step (a)(iii),

wherein the presence of a mutation in the individual subject that corresponds to mutation determined in step (a)(iii) is indicative of increased risk of hypercalciuria in said individual subject.

Cancel Claim 1; Change claims dependencies of pending claims.